



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,814	05/21/2001	John C. Seibel	068082.0114	1151

31625 7590 09/25/2003

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
PATENT DEPARTMENT
98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500
AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039

EXAMINER

LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/862,814

Applicant(s)

SEIBEL ET AL.

Examiner

Kuen S Lu

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

At page 9, "Client system 11" and "Administration system 14" are displayed as elements 13 and 12, respectively, in Fig. 1;

Page 14 describes "Referring to Figure 3,...process 21", however, process 21 is displayed in Fig. 2; and "database 32" in Page 14 is not shown in Figs. 1-3.

Appropriate correction is required.

The use of the trademarks ORACLE, FUSION, WINDOWS, NT/2000, SUN SOLARIS, etc., have been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 3-4 and 12-13 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "value add process" is believed a typo error. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 4-7, 10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as as being unpatentable over Doyle (U.S. Patent 6510432) and in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent 6,401,118).

As per claims 1 and 10, Doyle teaches "...a web archive database for storing web page data retrieved from the Internet" at col. 7, lines 61-65 and col. 8, lines 42-45.

As for "...a crawler process programmed to receive...web site addresses and to download web page data from...database", Doyle teaches using user input or other method to define a topic for the search and archive agent at col. 7, lines 34-38 and 47-49, and applying periodicity defined by user to schedule the search and archive agent to search data sources accessible through network at a pre-determined frequency at col. 7, lines 50-55 and to download web pages to store in the database at col. 8, lines 42-45.

Doyle does not specifically teach harvester process.

However, Thomas teaches "a harvester process for searching...web page data for prospects, based on criteria...and to provide the results...with a link to a document: that verifies the prospect's match to the criteria" at col. 6, lines 31-39, Fig. 3, element 308, col. 6, lines 54-58 and col. 9, lines 8-10;

"...the harvester process receives the criteria from the client via a client browser system and the internet" at Fig. 3, element 308 and col. 6, lines 31-39 while Doyle teaches "other methods of defining a topic for the search" at col. 7, lines 47-49; and "storing the web site data in a web archive" at col. 9, lines 54-64.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Thomas' teaching with Doyle's by creating a harvester process in search and archive agent because the combined teachings would

allow users of Doyle's system more flexible on defining the search criteria while Thomas' system allowed criteria to be stored into table for repeated use.

As per claim 4, Thomas teaches "wherein the value add process operates off line by accessing a database" at col 14, lines 46-50 and col. 9, lines 45-50.

As per claims 5-7 and 14-16, Thomas teaches "...process that provides contact data about the prospects" at col. 15, lines 8-13;

"...lookup is performed offline by accessing a database" at col. 16, lines 61-67; and

"...reverse lookup is performed online..." at col. 15, lines 8-13 and col. 16, lines 61-67.

2. Claims 2-3, 9, 11-13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle (U.S. Patent 6510432), in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent 6,401,118) as applied to claims 1, 4-7, 10 and 14-16, and further in view of Dwinnell (U.S. Pub. 2002/0161685A1).

As per claims 2 and 11, Doyle or Thomas does not specifically teach "... process that links the prospects to related business information."

However, Dwinnell teaches transmitting web page on-demand from remote site to the client over the Internet related to business information at Fig. 4 and col. 6, [0062]-[0062].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Dwinnell's teaching with Doyle's by expanding the web page view with a navigation link to remote site and its business feeds, because by doing so the dynamic interface web site would facilitate immediate business transactions between clients and web sites.

As per claims 3, 12 and 13, Doyle or Thomas does not specifically teach "...process operates on line by accessing the Internet" or "...process is performed off line".

However, Dwinnell teaches streams from remote site be sent to a central collection and distribution system for allowing media content to be transmitted to users on-line in real time mode or off-line by re-streaming the stored information and data at col. 6, [0062], lines 5-12.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Dwinnell's teaching with Doyle's by creating a central data collection and distribution system because by doing so users of Doyle's system would have been able to make expedient decisions based on the real-time observation of remote web site transactions.

As per claims 9 and 18, Thomas does not teach "...using a mailer process to prepare scripted correspondence to the prospects".

However, Dwinnell teaches using email for notifying users to go on line and access web site to view live for an ongoing event at col. 7, [0066], lines 15-21.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Dwinnell's teaching into Doyle's by using email system as a tool to look for incoming information and notifying users on incoming or ongoing events because email provides user convenience for sender and receiver.

3. Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle (U.S. Patent 6510432), in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent 6,401,118) as applied to claims 1, 4-7, 10 and 14-16, and further in view of Barton et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0072982A1).

Doyle or Thomas does not teach "...indexer process that indexes documents retrieved by the crawler process for access by the harvester process".

However, Barton teaches indexing sound recording archived in the library at col. 9, [0085] and [0086].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Barton's reference into Doyle's by creating indexes on the web database' tables which would have stored pointers for the full archive of web pages on a file system because such an implementation would improved the performance of database query and document retrieval.

Conclusions

The prior art made of record

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| A. U.S. Patent No. | 6401118 |
| B. U.S. Pub. No. | 2002/0161685A1 |
| C. U.S. Pub. No. | 2002/0072982A1 |
| D. U.S. Patent No. | 6510432 |

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| E. U.S. Patent No. | 6282548 |
| F. U.S. Patent No. | 6480885 |
| G. U.S. Pub. No. | 2002/0032725A1 |
| H. U.S. Pub. No. | 2002/0107701A1 |
| I. U.S. Pub. No. | 2002/0032603A1 |
| J. U.S. Pub. No. | 2002/0143870A1 |
| K. U.S. Pub. No. | 2001/0052003A1 |

L. U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0073058A1

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KL *K Lu*

Patent Examiner

September 4, 2003

John E. Breene

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100